

**Mission Bay Landfill  
Technical Advisory Committee  
Civic Center Plaza, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
July 16, 2004  
10:00 to 12:00**

**Meeting Minutes**

TAC Members Present

Donna Frye	Jeoffry Gordon	Barry Pulver	David Kennedy
Frank Gormlie	Rebecca Lafreniere	Dave Huntley	Brian McDaniel

Alternate TAC Members Present

Kathleen Blavatt	Susan Orlofsky
------------------	----------------

TAC Members Absent

Robert Curtis	Bruce Reznik	John Wilks
Ben Leaf	Judy Swink	Robert Tukey

Interested Parties/Alternates

Andrew Scott	Mahmood Hossain	Ellen Lirley
Vicky Gallagher	Tessa McRae	Alberto Zevallos
Jace Miller	Erik Anderson	Darlene Walter (for Patrick Owen)

Staff

Chris Gonaver	Steven Fontana	Ray Purtee
Beth Murray	Nicole Capretz	

The meeting was called to order by Councilmember Frye. Self introductions were made. Councilmember Frye asked the group if there were any comments? There was discussion concerning plans to build an amphitheater near the landfill and holding swap meets there. Councilmember Frye closed the discussion saying that those entities proposing such development should share their plans with the TAC.

**APCD Report On Air Monitoring**

Councilmember Frye introduced County Supervisor Cox and thanked him for participating in our project. Supervisor Cox addressed the APCD study results on ambient air monitoring at the Mission Bay landfill. The focus of the study was to determine if there were toxic compounds in the air compared to control sites elsewhere in the County. The good news is the landfill is not

emitting landfill gases and doesn't pose any threat to the public using the area. He then introduced Dick Smith, Director of the APCD, to go into more detail on the study. The study results were handed out to the group.

Dick Smith walked the group thru the report pointing out how the tests were conducted, parameters measured, and what compounds were tested for. There wasn't anything different in the levels measured at the landfill than at Kearny Mesa or El Cajon. Just background levels that are present in any large urban area.

Mahmood Hossain of the APCD spoke on the details of the sampling protocols- how sampling sites were chosen, the sampling systems used, and measures taken to ensure good quality samples and data. In answer to the question "What are allowable limits for airborne toxic compounds?" he responded there are none, but the laboratory's detection limit was close to the levels measured. In addition, two different measuring methodologies were used and they agree pretty closely in the test results.

The purpose of the study was to test ambient air at the site to see what people would be exposed to. Upon advice from the APCD meteorologist, wind roses used for Mission Bay were from the downtown area. Individual data from each of the three test locations is shown in the report. A question was asked, "How does this data compare to the 80's SWAT(Solid Waste Assessment Test)?" to which Mahmood replied he didn't think that a SWAT was done because it was an inactive site. Another question asked was "What about levels of refrigerants and toluene? Are they from the landfill?" Mahmood replied that the levels are low, just traces, and present at all three test sites. Questions asked included "How can a supervisor declare that the site's air is safe based on just one test for a military toxic waste dump in an earthquake fault zone?" and "How could you not test for methane, a common component of landfill gas or hydrogen sulfide?" Mahmood replied that this test tells us what is there today regardless of the landfill's past. This test went far beyond the Calderon[assembly bill 3525 initiating SWATs] requirements for specific compounds. Though tests were not conducted for methane or hydrogen sulfide, tests for other surrogates of landfill gas indicated whether landfill gas was present.

## **Approval of Minutes**

June meeting minutes were reviewed and approved with the following changes to page 2 , paragraphs # 2, 3, & 4. The paragraphs will now read:

Dr. Huntley and Dr. Gordon expressed their impression that the TAC was supposed to provide input into soil boring and well placement locations. It was their understanding that the geophysical and geotechnical data would be supplied to the TAC for review and comment as the study progressed, thereby allowing the committee the opportunity to address any concerns.

It was noted that having TAC review and input regarding specific geotechnical data might extend the anticipated completion date of the report. SCS was about to proceed assuming the goal of the soil borings was to define the extant and perimeter of any toxicants without disturbing any core sites.

Changes to the well and boring locations from the work plan were discussed. Committee members expressed a desire to review changes (from the work plan) to boring and well

locations with a view to assessing any pollutants in the core. It was felt that committee review and participation may help insure concurrence with the site assessment findings.

In discussion of the above changes, concern was expressed that a goal of the site assessment should be to learn what's down there in the landfill, as opposed to only learning whether or not the landfill is leaking. This is especially important when future uses of the site are unknown.

### **Subcommittee Report On Field Sampling**

Doctor Huntley reviewed the two subcommittee meetings and recommendations. At the first meeting, it was recommended that some perimeter sample borings not yet drilled be moved toward the middle of the landfill, to better characterize what's there in the waste. At the second meeting, this was accommodated by adding two additional borings rather than just moving two. VOC test results were reviewed, but the samples collected had been composited into blocks of five samples which didn't allow for distinguishing discrete samples where concentrations were highest. So the recommendation was made for additional discrete soil vapor samples in those two blocks where VOC's were the highest. SCS and the City agreed that additional costs would be incurred for the additional sampling.

Tessa McRae of SCS confirmed the subcommittee results and stated that there will be a total of four subcommittee meetings as field sampling data are obtained.

Chris Gonaver explained that ESD will go before the City council, probably in September, to ask for additional funding to accommodate SCS's additional work.

Many TAC members thanked the subcommittee for their work in reviewing the field data.

Councilmember Frye passed out copies of District 6's letter to the coastal commission. Sea World has re-applied for their parking lot expansion over the landfill. In their letter, District 6 recommends that the commission continue to deny a development permit to Sea World for expansion of their parking lot over the landfill, at least until the site investigation is completed.

### **Status of Site Assessment**

Tessa McRae explained what field work has been completed so far: the geophysical survey, the biological survey, soil vapor sampling, surface emissions sampling, and five of the ten borings. The work that remains is to pull the sediment samples, do five more borings, conduct a tidal survey, and install and sample new groundwater monitoring wells.

For the landfill gas survey, as borings were pushed down, to assess where they were vapor samples were grabbed from the cover and waste depths separately. These samples were composited.

### **Closing Remarks**

Councilmember Frye expressed thanks that the APCD spent time and resources to perform the ambient air test.

Remarks were made that this ambient air test was just a snapshot and shouldn't be used to reassure the public that the site is safe. Instead of comparing Mission Bay landfill air to El Cajon

or Kearny Mesa's, why not compare it to another close by coastal landfill site? In certain ecosystems like Mission Bay's, what about the interaction of CO2 compounds and seismic events? A seismic event could cause a release of these vapor compounds into the air.

In answer, Dr. Huntley stated the intent of the ambient air study was to compare the air to a non-landfill site. There will be additional testing by SCS for gases within the landfill.

Susan Orlofsky thanked the City and the TAC for including the Precautionary Principle in this study.

A remark was made that perhaps there are other municipal codes that the City can review that include Precautionary Principle language.

#### **Items for next agenda**

- Sub-committee report
- Status of SCS field work

#### **Future Meetings**

- Friday, Sept. 17, 2004, 10:00 am to 12:00 pm, CAB 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, Conference Room A
- Thursday, Oct 14, 2004, 10:00 am to 12:00 pm, CAB, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, Conference Room B
- Friday, Nov 19, 2004, 10:00 am to 12:00 pm, CAB, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, Conference Room B